

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-10 and rejected same. With this paper, new claims 11-16 are added, but the claims are otherwise unchanged. Thus, claims 1-16 are now pending.

Rejections under 35 USC §102

At section 1 of the Office action, claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,533,886 to Von Der Heyde et al. (hereinafter the Von Der Heyde).

Of the claims so rejected, only claim 1 is independent.

The Office asserts that Von Der Heyde discloses in Fig. 8 a pin protruding from the front surface of the diaphragm, the pin having a recess for mating with a post having a collar (which the Office notes is clearly seen in Fig. 1), and having an outer portion surrounding the recess and able to resiliently deform so as to squeeze through the collar when the pin is pushed onto the post. Applicant respectfully submits that close examination of Fig. 1 shows clearly that what is asserted by the Office as the "pin" of Van Der Heyde (the thickened hatched region, referred to as fastening protuberance 21) is not squeezed through the collar shown in Fig. 1, as required by claim 1. Instead, a safety membrane 39 is shown occupying the region between the collar of Fig. 1 and the "post" (drive pin 4). (Von Der Heyde teaches holding the membrane 3 onto the "post"/drive pin 4 via e.g. the widened head 4a of the drive pin 4 or by vulcanizing the drive pin to the fastening protuberance. See col. 6, ll. 18-26. Thus, the squeezing of the outer portion of the pin through the collar of the post recited in claim 1, which is explained in the application results in fastening the wobble plate to the diaphragm, is not taught or suggested by Von Der Heyde because Von Der Heyde teaches an entirely different way of fastening a diaphragm/ membrane to a wobble plate.)

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

At section 3 of the Office action, claims 3, 4 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Von Der Heyde in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,743,169 to Yamada.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, believed allowable for the reasons given above.

Of method claims 6-10, only claim 6 is independent, and recites the same features noted in traversing the rejection of claim 1.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

New claims

New claim 11 depends from apparatus claim 1, and more distinctly claims the invention in respect to locking of the post to the pin (and so the wobble plate to the diaphragm). In particular, claim 11 recites a collar extending outward from the wobble plate to substantially the same (about the same, including slightly farther than the) distance to which the post extends outward from the wobble plate. This then allows a secure locking of the pin from the diaphragm onto the post of the wobble plate. No such collar is taught or suggested by either Von Der Heyde or Yamada.

New claim 13 is a method claim depending from claim 6 and reciting the same features as new claim 11, and so is believed patentable over the applied art for the same reasons as given for claim 11.

New claims 12 and 14 depend respectively from new claims 11 and 13, and further recite other features of the collar (a

radially inward protruding region at the end near the tip of the post) and features of the pin (the thickened region of the pin serving as a locking feature) not shown in the applied references.

New independent claims 15 and 16 both recite a pin and a post with the pin having a wider section and a narrower section connected by a surface serving as a stop for engagement with a corresponding stop surface on the post. Both claims also encompass the pin attached to either the diaphragm or the wobble plat, and the post attached to the other of those two components, as clearly nothing about the invention requires the pin to be attached only to the diaphragm, or the post to be attached only to the wobble plate. Both claims also still recite a collar, and the recited collar is neither taught nor suggested by either Von Der Heyde or Yamada.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

Oct. 20, 2005

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234

Cust. No.: 004955